

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 were pending. Claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended. Therefore claims 1-23 remain pending in the application subsequent entry of the present amendment.

**Drawings**

Replacement sheets for Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 are provided herein. No new matter has been added.

**Specification**

Applicant has amended to specification in a manner believed to overcome the objections. No new matter has been added.

**Claim Objections**

Each of claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended in a manner believed to overcome the informality objections.

Claim 19 has not been amended to change “source synchronous data” to “said source synchronous data” as requested. While the system may transmit data corresponding to the received source synchronous data, the claim clearly recites the circuitry is configured to transmit the latched first data signal and corresponding clock signal in a source synchronous manner. Applicant believes this language to be clear and accurate.

Claim 23 has not been amended. Claim 23 introduces a second circuit. Therefore, the recited “further comprising” is believed proper.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

In the present Office Action, claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, it is objected that the claims recite a second clock is derived from a reference clock which is not believed supported by the figures. However, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Generally speaking, it appears the examiner has only considered the embodiment of Fig. 4. However, the sample embodiment of Fig. 7 clearly supports the features of claim 1. With reference to Fig. 7, the following comments are offered.

Claim 1 recites:

a first interface configured to receive the source synchronous data comprising a first data signal (452/455) and corresponding first clock signal (454/457);

a second interface configured to transmit source synchronous data; and

circuitry coupled to said first interface, wherein said circuitry is configured to:

utilize a reference clock signal (805) and said first clock signal to generate a second clock signal (459);

utilize said second clock signal to latch said first data;

generate a third clock signal (872); and

utilize said third clock signal to transmit said latched first data and a corresponding clock signal via said second interface in a source synchronous manner.

Therefore, Applicant submits the features of claim 1 are fully supported and withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

In addition to the above, claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, each of claim 1, 10, and 19 are rejected because “it is unclear how to generate a third clock.” However, each of claims 1 and 19 clearly recite circuitry configured to generate the third clock. Further, the claims recite a use of the third clock. Similarly, claim 10 recites generating a third clock signal using the third clock signal to transmit data. Therefore, Applicant does not believe the rejections to be appropriate. However, should the examiner continue to believe the claims are improper, the Applicant requests a citation of the requirements which it is believed are contravened by the claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the present Office Action, claims 1-4, 10-13, and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0075981 (hereinafter “Tang”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration.

Each of pending independent claims 1, 10 and 19 recite features directed to the receipt and transmission of source synchronous data. In contrast, Tang discloses a plesiochronous system. The recited features concerning source synchronous data are wholly absent from the cited art. Accordingly, the claims are not anticipated by Tang and withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-03800/RDR.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Rory D. Rankin /

---

Rory D. Rankin  
Reg. No. 47,884  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,  
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: November 21, 2006